

Under the provisions of Section 413.031 of the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, Title 5, Subtitle A of the Texas Labor Code, effective January 1, 2002 and Commission Rule 133.305 and 133.308 titled Medical Dispute Resolution by Independent Review Organizations, the Medical Review Division assigned an IRO to conduct a review of the disputed medical necessity issues between the requestor and the respondent.

The Medical Review Division has reviewed the IRO decision and determined, the total amount recommended for reimbursement does not represent a majority of the medical fees of the disputed healthcare and therefore, the **requestor did not prevail** in the IRO decision. Consequently, the requestor is not owed a refund of the paid IRO fee.

In accordance with §413.031(e), it is a defense for the carrier if the carrier timely complies with the IRO decision.

Based on review of the disputed issues within the request, the Medical Review Division has determined that **medical necessity was the only issue** to be resolved. The prescription medication, Hydro/APAP, was found to be medically necessary. The prescription medication, Vanadom, was not medically necessary, "as there is an effective generic alternative." The respondent raised no other reasons for denying reimbursement for the prescription medication charges.

On this basis, and pursuant to §§402.042, 413.016, 413.031, and 413.019 of the Act, the Medical Review Division hereby ORDERS the respondent to pay the unpaid medical fees in accordance with the fair and reasonable rate as set forth in Commission Rule 133.1(a)(8) plus all accrued interest due at the time of payment to the requestor within 20 days of receipt of this order. This Order is applicable to dates of service 7/15/01 through 2/7/02 in this dispute.

The respondent is prohibited from asserting additional denial reasons relative to this Decision upon issuing payment to the requestor in accordance with this Order (Rule 133.307(j)(2)).

This Order is hereby issued this 22nd day of April 2003.

Carol R. Lawrence
Medical Dispute Resolution Officer
Medical Review Division

CRL/crl

IRO Certificate #4599

NOTICE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW DECISION

November 4, 2002

Re: IRO Case # M5-02-3146

Texas Worker's Compensation Commission:

___ has been certified as an independent review organization (IRO) and has been authorized to perform independent reviews of medical necessity for the Texas Worker's Compensation Commission (TWCC). Texas HB. 2600, Rule 133.308 effective January 1, 2002, allows a claimant or provider who has received an adverse medical necessity determination from a carrier's internal process, to request an independent review by an IRO.

In accordance with the requirement that TWCC assign cases to certified IROs, TWCC assigned this case to ___ for an independent review. ___ has performed an independent review of the proposed care to determine if the adverse determination was appropriate. For that purpose, ___ received relevant medical records, any documents obtained from parties in making the adverse determination, and any other documents and/or written information submitted in support of the appeal.

The case was reviewed by a physician who is Board Certified in Neurological Surgery. He or she has signed a certification statement attesting that no known conflicts of interest exist between him or her and any of the treating physicians or providers, or any of the physicians or providers who reviewed the case for a determination prior to referral to ___ for independent review. In addition, the certification statement further attests that the review was performed without bias for or against the carrier, medical provider, or any other party to this case.

The determination of the ___ reviewer who reviewed this case, based on the medical records provided, is as follows:

History

The patient fell from a truck in ___ and developed pain in his back and leg. He also had significant injury to his mouth and teeth. He had a history of surgery on his low back in 1989. He also has a history of hypertension and diabetes, and has taken medication for both problems. In 1999 the patient had an anterior cervical discectomy and fusion at C5-6 for pain in his neck and upper extremities. The patient continues with pain, primarily in the low back, with extension into the lower extremities. Discographic evaluation has revealed L4-5 and L5-S1 showing concordant pain with abnormalities. The patient and the physicians caring for his diabetes and hypertension think that a major operative procedure at this time would be unwise.

Requested Service

Hydro/APAP and Vanadom 7/15/01- 2/7/02

Decision

I disagree with the carrier's decision to deny the patient medication, but I agree with the denial of Vanadom as there is an effective generic alternative.

Rationale

The patient has documented problems in his lumbar spine which are frequently associated with emotional disturbances and pain, requiring medications.

I agree with the denial of Vanadom instead of the generic form of the same medication, which is Carisoprodol. The generic can be used as effectively as the much more expensive Vanadom.

This medical necessity decision by an Independent Review Organization is deemed to be a Commission decision and order.

YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the decision and has a right to request a hearing.

If disputing a spinal surgery prospective decision, a request for a hearing must be in writing, and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **10** (ten) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 142.5(c)).

If disputing other prospective medical necessity (preauthorization) decisions, a request for a hearing must be in writing, and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Tex. Admin. Code 148.3).

This decision is deemed received by you 5 (five) days after it was mailed (28 Tex. Admin. Code 102.4(h) or 102.5(d)). A request for a hearing should be sent to:
Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Worker's Compensation Commission, P O Box 40669,
Austin, TX 78704-0012. **A copy of this decision should be attached to the request.**

The party appealing this decision shall deliver a copy of its written request for a hearing to all other parties involved in the dispute (Commission Rule 133.308(t)(2)).

Sincerely,